

AUG 01 2008

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

745 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10151
Telephone: (212) 588-0800
Facsimile: (212) 588-0500
E-mail: Firm@flhlaw.com

FACSIMILE COVER LETTER

To: Examiner Jean M. Corrielus
Firm: Art Unit 2162
Facsimile: (571) 273-8300
From: Frank J. DeRosa, Esq.
Date: August 1, 2008
Re: U.S. Application Serial No.: 10/045,586
Number of Pages: 3
(including cover page)

PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER CORRIELUS

If you do not receive all pages or are unable to read the transmission, please call and ask for Suzanne Graziano (Ext. 2664).

Dear Examiner Corrielus:

Enclosed is a summary of our teleconferences regarding entry of the Rule 312 Amendment. I would like to file it. May I have your comments?

Again, sorry that this is causing you inconvenience.

Respectfully,



Frank J. DeRosa

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The documents accompanying this transmission contain confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose. The information is private, and is legally protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this facsimile is strictly prohibited.

00570983.DOC

AUG 01 2008

336001-2021

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Fred C. MITCHELL et al. Confirmation No.: 8535
Application No.: 10/045,586 Examiner: Jean M. Corrielus
Filed: 01/11/2002 Group Art Unit: 2162
Title: DYNAMIC LEGAL DATABASE PROVIDING HISTORICAL AND
CURRENT VERSIONS OF BODIES OF LAW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**SUMMARY PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.333 OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS
WITH EXAMINER REGARDING RULE 312 AMENDMENT**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.333, the following summary is provided of telephone discussions between Examiner Corrielus and Applicants' undersigned Representative.

On or about June 13, 2008 Applicant's Representative requested reconsideration of the Examiner's denial of Applicant's Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.312 ("Rule 312 Amendment"). The reasons given were: (a) the requested amendments were all minor in nature, including several amendments to correct grammatical errors; (b) none of the changes would require further searching or reconsideration of patentability; (c) there was little or no burden on the Examiner to review the amendments given they were minor and straight forward and involved a small number of the total claims; and (d) there would have been a heavy burden on the Applicant to make these changes after issue of the patent.

On or about June 16, 2008, the Examiner agreed to enter the Rule 312 Amendment.

00570809.DOC

336001-2021

Between about June 23, 2008 and July 24, 2008, Applicants' Representative followed up with the Examiner a number of times because PAIR did not show that the Rule 312 Amendment had been entered.


On July 24, 2008 the Examiner left a voice message confirming that the Rule 312 Amendment had been approved and would be entered into PAIR.

During a telephone conference on July 31, 2008, the Examiner checked USPTO records and said the paper entering the Rule 312 Amendment was in the queue for PAIR, and that he did not know why it had not been entered, and would discuss it with his supervisor.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2008

By:


Frank J. DeRosa
Reg. No. 26,543
Attorney for Applicants
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Customer No.: 20999
(212) 588-0800